



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—ON THE TEXT OF MENANDER'S EPITREPONTES, WITH NOTES ON THE HEROS.

In the discussion of the plot of the *Epitrepontes* in the last number of this Journal, XXIX, 410ff., the attempt was made to show that the Tischendorf fragment Kock III, p. 421, as well as the verso of the same parchment strip, which Jernstedt published, is to be assigned to this play; that these two passages come from the final scenes of the third Act; and that the papyrus fragments R² and R¹ probably precede respectively the *recto* and *verso* of the parchment strip.¹ It was there maintained that this identification and arrangement restored to the play a series of consistent Smicrines scenes beginning with NT¹, and that these scenes in turn brought welcome and valuable information regarding the plot of the play.

Without further discussion the six passages which we have thus connected with each other are here given, with such restorations as seem best to suit the context. Restorations inclosed in square brackets are credited to their authors in the notes; those in pointed brackets are proposed by the writer. That we may have a definite starting-point for the reconstruction of the latter half of Act III, we should have before us the last lines of the monologue of Onesimus, contained in NT¹.

ACT III.

Scene 4 (end). Onesimus alone.

Onesimus: . . . ἀλλ' οὐτοσὶ

¹ If we can depend upon Lefebvre's indication of a lower margin of R (he is wrong in some cases), R² would thus belong at the bottom of p. 15 of the quaternion and R¹ at the bottom of p. 16. The interval between the last broken lines of R² and the Tischendorf fragment, and between the latter and R¹, would be from none to three verses; while between R¹ and the Jernstedt fragment the interval would be three verses or more, according to the size of the parchment page.

360. τίς ἐσθ' ὁ προσιών; Σμικρίνης ἀναστρέφει
 ἐξ ἄστεως πάλιν ταρα[κτι]κῶς ἔ[χ]ων
 αὖθις· πέπ[υσ]ται τὰς δα <πάνας Χαρ>ισ<ίου>
 παρὰ τινος οὗτος; ἐκ[ποδῶν, δὲ β]ούλομαι
 365. ποεῖν ἐ[μ]αντόν] δο[κ]εῖν
 προ κα]ί με δεῖ¹
 υ

[Exit Onesimus through parodos.

Scene 5. Smicrines alone.

Immediately after the departure of Onesimus Smicrines enters from the city. He explains why he has returned, no doubt verifying Onesimus' conjecture, v. 362. He certainly has not yet learned of the birth of a child by Pamphila, for that is revealed to him only toward the end of the play (v. 514). He of course knew of the alienation of Charisius and his daughter; doubtless his motive in visiting them in Act I was to effect a reconciliation (M¹, v. 11, p. 429 supra). He then believed that it was only a domestic squall that would blow over. He is not at all excited when we meet him in the Arbitration Scene; he is gruff and overbearing, but that was his nature. He had not then known, evidently, of the wild course of life, with its attendant extravagance, on which Charisius had embarked. It is about this that he has now heard rumors, this is the unpardonable offense in his eyes. Onesimus has read his character aright when he suggests the *δαπάναι*; cf. v. 481, ὁ χαλεπός, ἐπὶ τὴν προῖκα καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα ἤκων, and v. 483, λογιστικοῦ γὰρ ἀνδρός.

Smicrines probably announces here his intention of separating Pamphila from Charisius by legal action and thus saving the imperilled dowry. Had he known of Pamphila's illegitimate child, he could not have contemplated this action. But it was Charisius' deliberate purpose to force her to take this step, rather than himself to bring suit against her, and for this reason he has plunged into reckless debauchery and extravagant expenditure—or rather he makes a pretence of so doing for the sake of making the desired impression upon his miserly father-in-law.² And the

¹ 362. πέπυσται Wilamowitz. At the end τασλα ισ pap., with no indication of letters beyond.—364. Wilamowitz.—365-6. Körte.

² It is only by this supposition that we get an insight into his true character. He is chaste in his relations with Habrotonon (vv. 220, 462) and prides himself

present Act shows us that his purpose has been accomplished—or would have been if his lapse from virtue the year before had not become known and given a different turn to affairs.

A gap of some twenty-seven lines, then NT². In this interval enter Onesimus¹ and the Cook from the city side, and while they speak Smicrines observes them at a distance. Onesimus takes the Cook to task for being so late in keeping his engagement. Onesimus had been sent to the city to summon him in the first Act; in the third Act we are told that the company is gathering (v. 195) and that the Cook has not arrived (v. 166).

Scene 6. Smicrines (at one side), Onesimus, Cook.

- NT². Cook (continuing): . . . <οὐ γὰρ μαγείρων ἐστὶ δὴ>
 οὐδεὶς, σ<αφῶς οἶδ',> ἐχθρὸς ὑμῖν. Ones.: ποικίλον
 ἄριστον ἀρι[στώμε]ν! ὦ τρισάθλιος
 ἐγὼ κατὰ πολλ[ά]! νῦν μὲν οὖν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως
 δ[ια]σκεδᾶν <πρὸ νυ>κ<τ>ός· ἀλλ' ἐὰν πάλιν
 5. π<αραβῇ τις ὑμῶν, ὦ> μάγειρ', οὔ [τι]ς τύχη
 <σώσει σε. Cook: μηκέτ' ἐμ>ἐ καλεῖτ'. εἰς μακαρίας²

[Exit Onesimus into the house of Chaerestratus.

The purpose of this brief scene between Onesimus and the Cook is twofold: to bring the Cook to the house, that progress may be made with the day's festivities (and incidentally to furnish some lively cook-scenes to relieve the plot), and to enrage Smicrines still further by this ocular demonstration of the truth of the reports he had heard. It is to be an expensive entertainment. The Cook is of course accompanied, as an artist of his class should be, by a troupe of assistant cooks and waiters.

In the lacuna of ca. 54 verses that intervenes between NT² and R² it is possible that the Cook talks for a time with Smicrines

upon his impeccable conduct (vv. 429 ff.). His ὑψηλότης has even irritated his less squeamish father-in-law (NT²). For a justification of this view see supra, p. 421 ff.

¹ The new Photius fragment supports the view that it is Onesimus who here speaks to the Cook: τί δ' οὐ ποιεῖς | ἄριστον; ὃ δ' ἀλγεῖ πάλαι κατακείμενος. The quotation seems to be from the earlier part of this same scene.

² 2. Wilamowitz.—3. Robert, πολλά γε Körte, καταπόλλυς Leo.—4. For ὅπως w. infin. see Kühner-Gerth II, p. 377, Anm. 7. The object to be understood would be τοὺς ξένους.—6. μή με Croiset.

before entering the house. Fr. 175 K. would then belong here, spoken by the Cook with reference to Charisius.

Scene 7. Smicrines, Cook.

NT², v. 12.

Smic.: *ς τινος*

R². Smicrines (continuing):

τις
θω
<καὶ μ>άλα
<οὐκ οὐλώξ>εται;
5. <τοῦ> βίου
[το]ῦ δυστ[υχούς]
[τὸ]ν δυστυχῆ
ν. ἀλλ' ἴσως ἐγὼ
ὥτε πρᾶττω τῶν ἐμῶν
10. <ἀπάγει> ν τὴν θυγατέρα
σω καὶ σχεδὸν
νε¹

To this scene, after a very short gap, belongs the Tischendorf fragment. Smicrines reveals his true character with brutal frankness. He is not concerned about his daughter's happiness nor shocked at what he believes to be Charisius' moral downfall, but only anxious lest the dowry be squandered.

Tischendorf fragment.²

Smicrines (continuing): . . . <πίνει δὲ τιμώτατον>
ἄνθρωπος οἶνον· αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἐκπλήτ[τομαι]
ἔγωγ'. ὑπὲρ [δὲ] τοῦ μεθύσκεσθ' οὐ λέγω·
ἀπ[λη]στία γάρ ἐσθ' ὅμοιον τοῦτό γε,
εἰ καὶ βιάζεται κοτύλην τις τοῦβολοῦ
5. ὠνούμενος πίνειν ἑαυτόν. τοῦτ' ἐ[γὼ]
προσέμενον. οὗτος ἐμπεσὼν διασκ[εδᾶ]

¹9. τῶν ἐμῶν πρᾶττω pap., corrected by Leo.—10. Von Arnim compares v. 466.

²An excellent photograph of this parchment, which I owe to the courtesy of M. Kobeko, Director of the Imperial Public Library of St. Petersburg, clears up a number of doubtful points in this text. The ω at the end of 13 is practically certain; the word ἡμέρων must be the adjective, sc. ἀνδρῶν, cf. Dem. 21, 49: ἀνδρες οὕτως ἡμεροὶ καὶ φιλόανθρωποι. In 15 I read ΝΠ. εω for Jernstedt's ντ . . ω; the ε has a short lower arm, as e. g. once in 6; before ποτέ the

τὸν ἔρωτα. τί δ' ἐμοὶ τοῦτο; πάλιν οἰμῶ[ξεται] !
 προῖκα δὲ λαβὼν τάλαντα τέτταρ' ἀργύ[ρου],
 οὐ τῆς γυναικὸς νενόμιχ' αὐτὸν οἰκέ[την].*

10. ἀπόκοιτός ἐστι. πορνοβοσκῶ δώδεκα
 τῆς ἡμέρας δραχμὰς δίδωσι, δώδεκα !
 <πέπυσ> τ' ἀκ[ρι]βῶς οὕτως τὰ πράγματα.
 <τί δ' εἰ> s διατροφὴν ἀνδρὶ καὶ πρὸς ἡμέρῳ[ν]
 <ἀρκεῖν λ> ελ[όγ]ισται; δὴ' ὀβολοὺς τῆς ἡμέρας.
 15. [τελεῖ]ν π<λ>έω πεινῶντι τίς <λόγο>s ποτέ;

[Chaerestratus approaches with Onesimus.

Scene 8. Smicrines, Chaerestratus, Onesimus.

16. Ones.: <ὀρῶ τιν'> ὅς <σε> προσμένει, Χαιρέ<στρατε>.
 Chaer.: [τίς ὁδ' ἐσ]τὶ δ[ή], γλυκύταθ'; Ones.: ὁ τῆς <νύμφης
 π>ατήρ,
 <καταλοιδορ>ὼν ὡς ἄθλιός τις <τῆς τύχης>.
 Smicr.: <καὶ νῦν ἔχει τιν', ὁ> τρισκακοδ[αίμων, ψάλ]τριαν,
 <τῇν τ' οὐδὲν ἀδικοῦ>σαν γυναῖκα <βούλεται>

ιοι

s

letter C is visible. The supplement λόγος (due to B. L. G.) might crowd the space a little. In v. 16 not *χαιρῷ* but *χαιρε* (or *ο*), making the proper name almost a certainty. In 5 of the verso *ροπον* is as likely as *τοπον*.

The punctuation in the recto is important for the restoration: *ἐαντόν*: in 5 (w. paragraphus), *ἔρωτα*: in 7 (w. paragraphus), *δίδωσι*: in 11, *πράγματα*. in 12, *-σται*: and *ἡμέρας*: in 14, *γλυκύτατε*: and *-ατηρ*: in 17. The indications of alternating speakers in 5 and 7 can hardly be correct; the successive charges against the delinquent person must proceed from the same speaker. The whole passage has the character of a tirade uninterrupted by a second person. The marks in 5 and 7 are probably due to the questions and answers which the speaker addresses *to himself*, which led the scribe to assume a dialogue. Precisely the same thing happened in the Cairo papyrus, Epitr. 476, 477, where double point and paragraphus are wrongly inserted in the discourse of Onesimus.

¹ The positive form of statement in v. 1 shows that the fault just mentioned was not simply drinking, or drinking to excess, but wasting money in drink. *ἐκπλήττομαι*, Cobet.—3. *ἀπληστία* Wilamowitz, *ἀπιστία* MS.—4. *τοῦβολοῦ* Cobet.—7. *τὸν ἔρωτα* could easily be a corruption of *τὰ πατρώια*. Smicrines does not care if Charisius uses up *his own* inheritance. Cf. Diph. 553 K., *τὰ πατῶα βρῖκει καὶ σπαθῶ*. With *τὸν ἔρωτα* the figure is unparalleled.—8. Cobet.—9. Cobet.—12. *τακ* MS, *πέπυστ'* Van Leeu., *ἀκριβῶς* Hiller.—13. s, *τί δ'* Jern., *εἰς* Cobet.—14. *ελ* . . . *σται* MS, *λελόγισται*

After a short gap comes R¹. Chaerestratus precedes Smicrines as speaker.

- R¹. *av*
ἀλλ'
απα
οὐδ' α
5. *μέρος τ*
ἢ μή με
ἡμῖν κεκήδ[ευκας] Smic.: [φαίνεται]
- ὑψηλὸς ὧν τις [οὗτος]. οὐκ οἰμώζεται,*
καταφθαρείς τ' ἐν ματρυλείῳ τὸν βίον
10. *μετὰ τῆς καλῆς <πόρνης τὸ λοιπὸν ἡδέως>*
βιώσεθ', ἡμᾶς δ¹ ;

After a gap of from two to six lines we come to the end of the same scene in the Jernstedt fragment. The first words, which are those of Chaerestratus, imply that he has just made some promise; perhaps he has given his assurance that Charisius will mend his ways. He too is unaware that Charisius is pretending to be dissolute with the deliberate purpose of forcing a process for a separation upon Smicrines.

Jernstedt fragment. Continuation of Scene 8.

Chaerestratus (continuing):

- [οὕτως ἀγα]θὸν τί σοι γένοιτο! Smic.: μὴ λέγε
 <σύ μοι τάδ'>. οὐκ ἐς κόρακας; οἰμώξει μακρά!
 [ἀλλ' εἴμι ν]ῦν εἴσω, σαφῶς τε πυθόμενος
 [τὰ πράγματ' ε]ὔ τὰ τῆς θυγατρὸς, βουλεύσομαι
5. [δντινα τρ]όπον πρὸς τοῦτον ἤδη προσβαλῶ.

[Exit Smicrines into Charisius's house.]

Ones.: <βούλει μ> ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦτον ἤκοντ' ἐνθάδε
 [φράσω]μεν; Chaer.: οἶον κίναδος! οἰκίαν ποεῖ

Cobet.—15. νπ.εω MS, τελεῖν Gomperz, ἀρκεῖν Kock. -τιτιτισ MS, dittography?—16. οσ . . προσμενειχαίρε MS.—17. Jern., νύμφης Kock.—19, end, Jern.

¹ Verses 8, 9=Men., Epitr. 177 K. (omitting τ'), identified by Von Arnim. The change of speakers in v. 7 is indicated in the papyrus.—7. κεκήδευκεν Leo, φαίνεται Robert.—8. οὗτος, Von Arnim. οἰμώζεται; cf. πάλιν οἰμώζεται, Tisch., v. 7. The question, βιώσεται, is of course sarcastic.

[ἀνάστα]τον. Ones.: πολλὰς ἐβουλόμην ἄμα.

Ch.: <τί λέγεις>; On.: μίαν μὲν τὴν ἐφεξῆς. Ch.: τὴν ἐμήν;

10. Ones.: [τὴν σ]ὴν γ'. Ἴωμεν δεῦρο πρὸς Χαρίσιον.

[A crowd of drunken youth approaches.

Chaer.: [ἴωμ]εν, ὥς καὶ μειρακυλλίων ὄχλος

[εἰς τ]ὸν τόπον τις ἔρχεθ' ὑποβεβρεγμένων

[οἷς μὴ] 'νοχλεῖν εὐκαιρον εἶναί μοι δοκεῖ.

[Exeunt Chaerestratus and Onesimus into the former's house.

CHORUS.

Act IV.

Scene 1. Onesimus alone.

Enter Onesimus from the house of Chaerestratus.

Ones.: ἐπισ[φαλῇ μὲν] πάντα τὰνθ[ρώπει' ἐμοί],

15. οἶμ[αι], πόλις ἐστὶ καὶ καταφυγὴ καὶ νόμος

καὶ τοῦ δικαίου τοῦ τ' ἀδίκου παντὸς κριτῆς

ὁ δεσπότης· πρὸς τοῦτον ἔνα δεῖ ζῆν ἐμέ.

ὁ γέρω <ν δ' ἐκείνος, ὁ κατάρτος Σμικρίνης> ,

οὐδὲ λό<γον ἡμῶν οὐδ' ἐπιστροφὴν ἔχει>¹.

On Jernstedt's 2b only scanty remains of the first three lines of the new act are preserved; viz., ἐπι . . παντατανθ in v. 14, and καί at the beginning of v. 16. But on the third strip of parchment of the Uspenski collection Jernstedt read, side by side with and over some remains from Menander's Canephorus (identified by Kock), the first letters of six verses written backward. These letters he recognized as an offset from the bottom of 2b, for the first and third lines begin ἐπισ and καίτου respectively. Evidently 2b and 3a had at some time been stuck together, and 3a had

¹ 1. οὕτως Kock, ἀγαθόν Jernstedt.—3. Jern.—4. ντα, Jern.—5. Van Leeuwen, τοπον MS.—6, 7. Fully one more letter is required in the space in 6 than in 7. φράσωμεν Jernstedt. For the participial construction see Kock on Arist. Nub. 1365 and Rh. Mus. 48, p. 235.—8. Kock.—10, 11, 12. Jernstedt.—13. Kock. The changes of speakers in vv. 1, 7, 8, 9 are indicated by the colon. It is possible that v. 5 should be given to Onesimus; in that case read τίνα δὴ τρέπον.—15. οἶομαι MS. These verses are quoted, from ἐμοί, omitting οἶμαι.—19. ὑμῶν or ἡμῶν, ἔχων, ἔχω or ἔχει are variously quoted. The γέρων of v. 18 is of course Smicrines, the δεσπότης is Charisius.

taken most of the ink from 2b. From these remains Jernstedt recognized the original of Men. fr. inc. 581 K., by the aid of which he restored vv. 15-17. The beginning of Men. fr. inc. 836 K., quoted to illustrate λόγος = φροντίς, also coincides with the remains of v. 19 and suits the context admirably. τὰνθρώπει' in v. 14 is due to Professor C. W. E. Miller, for Jernstedt's τὰνθρώπων.

During the song of the Chorus Onesimus has witnessed the interview between Charisius and his father Chaerestratus, who no doubt had been affected by the threats of Smicrines and desired to bring about a change in his son's course of life. Probably Charisius now gave him a full explanation of his motives and the ends to be gained by his apparently dissolute conduct. The insolence of Smicrines and his overbearing demands have not caused him to change his purpose. After an expression of loyalty to his master (with which cf. Habrotonon's injunction in Q¹), Onesimus explains to the audience the present state of affairs.

The affairs of the household have reached a crisis. So far the plan of Onesimus and Habrotonon has not succeeded, because the mother of the child has not been found. Probably one of the early scenes in Act IV was a conversation between Onesimus and Habrotonon as the latter is about to see Charisius and tell him of the discovery of his child. Here would fall also the scene or scenes of the jesting Cook, of which we have several small fragments, and the dialogue between Smicrines and Pamphila if Men. fr. 566 K. is rightly referred to this play by Robert. The interval of three and a half pages between the beginning of Act IV in the Jernstedt fragment and the Sophrona-Habrotonon scene in H¹ was probably devoted mainly to the counter-plot of Onesimus and Habrotonon.

Habrotonon has so carefully explained her scheme to Onesimus in vv. 295 ff. that we have a fair idea of the situation into which we are introduced at the beginning of H¹, in spite of the fact that about three and a half pages of the papyrus (ca. 125 vv.) are lost between the Jernstedt fragment and this, and in spite of the exceedingly mutilated condition of the first eleven lines of H¹. Habrotonon has visited the wife of Syrisus, wept over the baby, and pumped the foster-mother for information; she has then interviewed Charisius with the child in her arms. He evidently believes her story that she was the girl of the Tauropolia episode (H², vv. 22 ff.). When she appears at the beginning of H¹, she

has just come from this interview, very happy at the outcome, and she is now prepared to undertake at her leisure the search for the mother (v. 320). A few moments before Sophrona had come from Pamphila's house and had explained to the audience the pitiful condition of her mistress, hopelessly alienated from her husband, and on the point of a rupture with her father, who has threatened to take her away by force if she will not consent to go of her own accord. The bitter quarrel between Pamphila and her father which she has witnessed fills her with despair. At first she does not see Habrotonon with the child, decked out with the *γνώρισμα*, but the woman's demeanor and words soon draw her attention. She infers that the child does not belong to the woman who carries it; later she sees the *δέρα* and recognizes the child. Habrotonon, on her part, has at the first glance recognized in Sophrona the attendant of the girl of the Tauropolia episode.

Körte's new readings have considerably advanced our understanding of vv. 7-11 of H¹, which may have run about as follows:

Habrotonon (continuing): καλῶς σε, παῖ,—

Soph.: οὐ <παῖδα τόνδ' αὐτῇ τεκεῖν δ> οκέῖς, <γύν>αι.

Habr.: αὐτῇ 'στὶν [ἦν ἐγ]ῶδα! χαῖρε, φιλτάτη

γ<ύναι, σὺ> δ<είξον> δ[εῦ]ρό μοι τὴν σ[τὴν θέαν].

10. Soph.: λέγ' ἐμοί, [τί] λέγεις; Habr.: πέρυσι <γεν>έσθ'
<ἄμ'> ἐμοὶ <σὺ φῆς>

τοῖς Ταυροπ(ο)λίοις; εἰπ<έ· μ>έλ<λεις>; ἦ<σθ' ἐκεῖ>;¹

To leave no doubt that the woman she sees within the house is really the wife of Charisius, Habrotonon deftly questions Sophrona. In v. 20 the first words of this leading question are broken away, and most of the attempts to restore them involve a different management of the speakers from that indicated in the papyrus. Here we must assume, as Laird has well shown (Class. Phil. 3, p. 335) that the ring again comes into play. When Sophrona asks, "Are you absolutely certain that Charisius is the father", I conceive that Habrotonon answered with another question, one that would bring certainty to Sophrona as to the identity of the father and to herself as to the identity of the

¹ 8. Körte.—9. δέυρο Von Arnim. σὴν θέαν Robert.—10. τί J. W. White, γ' δ Crönert and Körte. The paragraphus indicates a change of speaker in or at the end of this line.

mother. So holding out the ring she asks, "Do you know this to be his, whose wife I see within"?

Habr.: Χαρισίου. Soph.: τοῦτ' οἷσθ' ἀκριβῶς, φιλότατη;

Habr.: <τόν> δ' (i. e. the ring) οἶσθα τοῦδ' ὄνθ', οὐ γὰρ τὴν
νύμφην ὄρω,

τὴν ἔνδον οὖσαν; Soph.: ναίχι. Habr.: μακαρία γύναι!

The following miscellaneous textual changes are suggested:

131. Syr.: οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιον, εἴ τι τῶν τούτου σε δεῖ
ἀποδιδόναι, καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς ζητεῖ<ν> λαβεῖν.

ζητεῖς pap. "It is not right, just because you have got to give up some of this child's property, to try in addition to get him too". Davus has set up the alternative (vv. 71 ff.) that Syricus shall either keep the child as it is, without the tokens, or give it back, protesting against the claim that the tokens go with the child. As the text stands εἰ is made to do double duty and with a different sense in each clause—'because' and 'if'. I doubt whether so awkward a construction can be paralleled. I see that Van Leeuwen in his second edition, while retaining ζητεῖς, queries ζητεῖν in the note. It is the simplest remedy.

156. Dav.: [ὅπως σ]ὺ νῦν
τούτῳ φυλάξεις αὐτ<ὰ> σώσεις τ' ἀσφαλῶς>,
εὖ ἴσθι, τηρήσω σε π[άν]τα [τόν χρὸ]νον.

The construction τηρεῖν ὅπως with the future indicative is so common that Lefebvre's restoration of v. 156 should be accepted, though not his punctuation, which cuts off the ὅπως-clause from τηρήσω. Cf. Arist., Pol. 7. 1309 b 16, τηρεῖν ὅπως κρεῖττον ἔσται τὸ—πλήθος, and Isoc. 7, 30. We require an object of φυλάξεις referring to the tokens (Leo, Hense, Ellis αὐτά), and as much emphasis as possible on the injunction itself. Hense's ἐπιμελῶς or ἀσφαλῶς was in the right direction; I prefer the latter on account of v. 191, ἢ σφῆξε τοῦτον (the ring) ἀσφαλῶς. For σώσεις cf. also v. 180, οἶον τὸ σώσθαι χρήματ' ἐστὶν ὀρφανοῦ!

210. καλῶς [ἔχει]
ἕτερόν τι πρὸς τούτοις κυκᾶν. <καίτοι γ' ἐμοί>
κάνταῦθα κακὸν ἔνεστιν ἐπεικῶς [μέγα].

Onesimus confronts a dilemma. If he shows Charisius the ring, the evidence of his guilt, the result may be disastrous to

him: Charisius may be reconciled with Pamphila and visit severe punishment on his slave, who shares the secret (*συνειδότα*, v. 210). The other alternative would be to return the ring to Syrisus—a course which Onesimus in v. 219 pronounces absurd. He is sorry that he ever told his master about Pamphila (v. 205), but that act cannot be recalled. It has been generally assumed that Onesimus resolves in vv. 210f., as he does in v. 356, to avoid stirring up trouble in the future; but not only does the papyrus not favor Wilamowitz' *φυλάξομαι*, according to Körte, but the sentiment of v. 212 and the phrasing of v. 211 seem to point the other way. The only resource left to Onesimus is to devise some additional complication, though he recognizes the fact that this course also is not free from risk. While he is wavering, undecided, Habrotonon appears, and between them they finally work up the *ἑτερόν τι κύκημα*. The personal pronoun *ἐμοὶ* is needed to complete the thought of v. 212, for Onesimus is thinking of only his own risk. *ἔχει* Eitrem, *μέγα* Wilamowitz, supported by the traces in the papyrus.

215. *ἐράσθαι* <*προσεδόκων*>, cf. Anax. 22, l. 29 K. *οἱ δ' ἐράσθαι προσδοκῶντες*. Von Arnim proposed *μὲν ἐδόκουν*, but in contrast with Charisius' hatred is rather the expectation which Habrotonon had cherished than her belief.

251. *αἶ, δύσμορ', εἴ<π'>· εἰ τρέφειμος ὄντως ἐστί σου,*
τρέφόμενον ὄψει τοῦτον ἐν δούλῳ μέρει;
κοῦκ ἂν δικαίως ἀποθάνοις;

εἴτ' Lefebvre, but I suspect a *π*. *εἰπέ* would better represent Habrotonon's indignant question than the more deliberate *εἴτα*.

260. *Ταυροπο* <*λίους*· *π*> *αἰσὶν γὰρ ἔψαλλον κόραις*
αὕτη θ' [*όμοῦ συν*]*νέπαιζ* <*ε*>· *οὐδ' ἐγὼ τότε—*
οὕτω γὰρ ἄνδρ' ᾗδειν τί ἐστί, καὶ μάλα
μὰ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην— Ones.: *τὴν δὲ παῖδ' ᾗτις [ποτ'] ᾗν*
οἶσθας; Hab.: *πυθοίμην ἄν, κτέ.*

Körte reports, in v. 260, . *αἰσιν* γὰρ and reads *αἶσιν γάρ*, though this does not wholly fill the space and though the old dative form is without parallel in Menander. But not only is the form objectionable, the whole sentence is intolerably awkward. For *παῖσιν κόραις* cf. Arist. Lys. 595 *παῖδα κόρην γεγάμηκεν* and Theophilus II, 12 Kock *παιδὸς κόρης (ἐρῶν)*.

In v. 261 there should be a pronoun referring to the girl, of whom Habrotonon is about to relate the story. "I was playing the lyre for the girls and this girl was one of the merry-makers". It is hard to see how the music-girl, who was hired to play the psalter for the dance, could herself have participated in the dance. αὐτῇ and the third person seem necessary. Then Habrotonon, before coming to the point of her story, makes a digression to explain why her suspicions were not aroused at the time—she was innocent, then, of all thought of evil. Onesimus recalls her to her subject by his impatient question. Körte's ποτέ gives precisely the right tone. The poet brings in admirably, and for a distinct purpose, this incidental allusion to Habrotonon's girlish innocence.

268, αὐτῇ ὅστιν τυχόν. It is the possibility of the *identity* of the girl whom Habrotonon had seen and the girl who took the ring from Charisius (v. 236) that concerns Onesimus.

303. ἐὰν δ' οἰκεῖον ᾗ
αὐτῷ τὸ πρᾶγμα, <εὔ' ἴσθ', ἐπ' > ξει φερόμενος
ἐπὶ τὸν ἔλεγχον.

The papyrus gives εὐθὺς ᾗξει, one syllable short. Since Hense cited the very similar expression in Lyc. c. Leocrat. 59, ᾗξει δ' ἴσως ἐπ' ἐκείνον τὸν λόγον φερόμενος, it has been felt that ᾗξει is not likely to be corrupt, and one-syllable words, like μάλ', Hense and Van Herwerden, and οἷδ' Richards, have been suggested. But the expression here is likely to have been somewhat more picturesque than the orator's phrase, and a closer parallel is found, as to language, thought, and situation, in Eur., Ion 327, where Creusa says to Ion :

οὐδ' ᾗξας εἰς ἔρυναν ἐξευρεῖν γονάς ;

328. Punctuate: ἐὰν δὲ μηκέτι ζητῆς ἐκείνην ἐξεπίτηδες, ἀλλ' ἑᾶς, παρακρουσαμένη με.

- Q¹. Onesimus (continuing): . . . [νῆ τὸν Ἀπόλ]λω! . . .
X[αιρέστρ]αθ'· ᾗδε τὸ μετὰ τα<ῦτα "δεῖ σ'," ἔφη>,
"ὅπως [δια]μενεῖς ὦν Χαρισίῳ [τὸ πᾶν],
οἷός περ (ᾗ)σθα, πιστός." οὐ γάρ ἐσ<τί τοι>
5. ἐταιρίδιον τοῦτ' οὐδὲ τὸ τυχόν <ὅ τι ποιεῖ>.
σπουδῇ δὲ καὶ παιδάριον ἐ<ξηύρηκέ σοι>.
ἐλευθερο<ῦ>. πιάξ! μὴ βλέπ' εἰ<ς τὴν γῆν ἔχων>.

καὶ πρῶτον αὐτὸν κατὰ μόν<ας Χαρίσιον>,
τὸν φίλτατον καὶ τὸν γλυκύτατ<ον παιδία σου>,
<λαβὼν . . >¹

456 (441). τῆς γαμετῆς γυναικὸς ἐστὶ σου·
<τὸ σὸν> γάρ, οὐκ ἀλλότριον.

If we adopt Körte's τέκνον, the γάρ is noticeably far from the beginning of the sentence. Körte estimates the lacuna at about five letters. For the proposed restoration cf. v. 459 ναί, καὶ σὸν γ' ὁμοίως.

528 (512): Smic.: σὺ μοι χολὴν
[κ]ινεῖς παθαινομένη. σὺ γὰρ σφόδρ' οἶσθ' ὅτι
<τέρας> ε λέγει νῦν. Soph.: οἶδ' ἐ[γωγ'], εὖ ἴσθ', ὅτι
<τέρας'> ἀ<μφ>ότερα συνῆκε. Smic.: πίνδεινον λέγεις.

For τέρας λέγειν cf. Plat., Hipp. mai. 283 c, τέρας λέγεις καὶ θαυμαστόν. σὺ γὰρ σφόδρα cannot introduce a question, as Nicole's conjecture οὔτος would require. In v. 531 ἀτεστερα Körte. In her answer Sophrona refers to the words of Onesimus in v. 502, τέρασιν ὅμοια πεντάμηνα παιδία ἐκτρέφωμεν. The "prodigies" which Onesimus has correctly interpreted are of course the two nothoi, which he has proved to be one.

NOTES ON THE HEROS.

At the bottom of A¹ the first part of eight consecutive verses (8-17) is broken away in the papyrus. Before and after the break the text is perfectly sound. The restoration of these verses is not of great importance so far as the plot of the Heros is concerned, but it is important that whatever context we supply in this portion of the conversation of the two slaves, Geta and Davus, should not be repugnant to the characters which the poet desired to give them. And this seems to me to be true of the restorations which Van Leeuwen has printed in his text.

The leading characteristics of the two slaves are sufficiently outlined in the forty odd good verses which remain. Davus is painfully serious and so absorbed in his woe that he barely

¹ 1. Robert.—2. Χαίρεσθραθ' Sudhaus, ταῦτα Leo.—3. διαμενεῖς Ellis.—4. ἦσθα Von Arnim, οἶσθα pap.—6. εκω pap. Körte, κω being very uncertain.—7. ἐλεύθερος pap.—8. κατὰ μόνας Van Herwerden.

notices the light badinage of Geta. And of course, in his infatuation for Plangon, he exaggerates the difficulties of the situation. These seem to be merely: (1) that Plangon, a free-born girl, is placed in the position of a quasi slave¹ on account of her dead father's unpaid debts and has to do light housework for Davus' mistress; and (2) that Davus' master, who has given a provisional consent to his marriage with the girl, is absent on a trip to Lemnus (vv. 45 f.) and so has not yet asked for the approval of Plangon's brother to the match. But Davus rehearses these trivial troubles with a tragic pathos² that evokes the ridicule of Geta, as had the exaggerated exhibition of grief in the opening lines. Geta, besides being a wag, is a cynic on the subject of the tender passion. When Davus acknowledges that he is in love, Geta suggests (vv. 18 f.) that the real trouble is over-feeding, and somewhere in this first scene (see below) he makes an even more brutal reply (fr. 345 K., recognized by Leo and Legrand).

From these indications we are able to recognize clearly enough the characteristics of these slaves, both familiar types. And, if I am able to catch the drift of the last eight lines on A² in their sadly mutilated condition, the sarcastic humor of Geta runs on and continues to interrupt the exposition of the present situation which Davus is trying to give. The following is offered with diffidence, but seems to me to represent the probable course of the conversation.³

Da.: ὑπέσχηται τ' ἐμ[ο]ῖ σ[υνοικιεῖν]
αὐτήν, διαλεχθεὶς πρὸ[ς] τὸν ἀδελφόν.] <Ge.: πῶς ἄρ' εἶ>

¹ This is the meaning of ὁρῶν | συντρεφόμενην, ἄκακον, κατ' ἐμαυτὸν in v. 19: "when I see a girl, innocent thing, kept in my station", which Van Leeuwen has misunderstood. Van Leeuwen sets up the contrast κατ' ἐμαυτὸν and ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτόν, cf. Epitr. 104. But συντρεφόμενην κατ' ἐμαυτόν = ὡς δούλην; cf. the familiar phrases κατ' ἀνθρώπον, κατὰ σε, κηδεύσαι καθ' ἑαυτόν, Aesch., Prom. 890, etc. So Geta understands *Davus*, for he asks in v. 20 δούλη ὅτιν; and the answer is οὕτως, ἡσυχῇ, τρόπον τινά.

² The laughter of Geta in v. 38 is explained by the contrast between the words of Davus and the emotion with which he speaks them.

³ A change of speakers is indicated by the paragraphus in vv. 44, 48, by the double point without the paragraphus in v. 49. I have assumed a break in v. 45 also; but it is of course possible that Davus resumes at the beginning of the verse. Certainly it is he who tells of the absence of his master Laches.

45. <πενθη>ρός; Da.: ἀποδημῇ τρ[ιταῖος ἐπὶ τινα]
 πρᾶξιν ἰδ[ία]ν εἰς Λῆμ[νον]. <ἤκοι γ' ἀσφαλῶς>!
 Ge.: ἐχόμεθα τῆς αὐτῆς <ἐπιθυμίας· πάλιν>
 σῶζοιτο! Da.: χρηστὸν <τοῖς θεοῖς θῦσαι· τάχ' ἄν>
 ὄνησις εἴη. Ge.: πολὺ π<ρεπόντως καὶ καλῶς>
 50. φρονεῖς. ἐγὼ γὰρ κα<ὶ πένης ὦν σφόδρ' ἄν ἐρῶν>
 θύσαιμ' ἄλις, νῆ τὸν Πο[σειδῶ], <τοῖς θεοῖς>!

Here Geta apparently calls a woodgatherer to bring wood for the proposed sacrifice. Fr. 345 K. may have come immediately after, somewhat as follows:

ὦ ξυλοφόρ', < εἰς θυσίαν σὺ δεῦρο φέρε ταχὺ>
 <πλήθος ξύλων.> Da.: οὐπώποτ' ἠράσθης, Γέτα;
 Ge.: οὐ γὰρ ἐνεπλήσθην.

ἐμοὶ συνοικιεῖν 43, πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφόν 44 Lefebvre; *τριταῖος ἐπὶ τινα* 45, *ιδίαν εἰς Λῆμνον* 46 Crönert; *ἄλις νῆ τὸν Ποσειδῶ* 51 Wilamowitz. The first part of v. 45 is very difficult. Lefebvre reports *τελεμερος*, while Körte, who regards λ also as certain, can make nothing of the other letters. Since a remark by Geta breaks the narrative of Davus, and the adjective in -ρος can hardly belong to the following, *πενθηρός*, luctuosus, suggests itself as at least worth testing. It is cited by Herodian and Draco as used by Anaxilas (fr. 34, p. 274 K.) of a black mourning garment.

Let us now return to the broken lines 8–17. For their restoration, at least in substance, there are several certain clues, apart from the all-important one of the character of Geta. In 15b we have: Ge. *τί σὺ λέγεις; ἐρᾷς*; Da. *ἐρῶ*. Therefore 15a must contain Davus' admission of his passion, as all critics have seen. 14b, Da. *μὴ καταρῶ, πρὸς [τῶν] θεῶν*, implies just as clearly a curse 14a, though the fact has been overlooked. The indications in the ends of vv. 8–13 are not so clear, but if we observe the character of Geta and what has preceded we can supply a consistent context. Now in the first lines Geta, seeing the violent manifestations of grief on the part of Davus—beating the head, pulling out hair, groans—draws the natural conclusion that he has committed some enormous offense and is in dread of condign punishment. He is confirmed in this assumption when Davus, in answer to the question *τί στένεις*, responds with a wail, *οἶμοι*. Geta's conclusion is: *τοιούτῳν ἐστίν, ὃ πονηρὲ σί*.¹ He accordingly,

¹ So to be punctuated, and not as a question (as Leo and Van Leeuwen).

following up this idea, suggests that, besides the physical punishment, Davus is likely to have his little hoard of money taken from him and requests that it be given to him for safe-keeping. The preserved verse-ends show that Davus does not fall in with this suggestion, that Geta becomes angry and finally lets out a curse, which has the effect of bringing Davus to his declaration in v. 15.

- Ge.: εἴτ' οὐκ ἐχρῆν κερμάτιον, εἰ συνηγμένον
 [σοὶ τυγχάν]ει τι, τοῦτ' ἐμοὶ δοῦναι τέως,
 <μὴ πλείον' ἔλκῃς ἐπὶ> σεαυτὸν πράγματα;
 10. <οὐ φῆς σύ γ' ; εἰκότως σ> ννάχθομαί γέ σοι'
 <ἀεὶ γὰρ εἰ φθονε>ρ<ός>. Da.: σύ, μὰ Δί', οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι
 <ληρεῖς' κακῶ γὰρ ἐμπ> ἐπληγμαι πράγματι,
 <λύπη τε δεινὴ πάνυ δι> ἐφθαρμαι, Γέτα.
 <Ge.: κάκιστ' ἀπόλοιο—>. Da.: μὴ καταρῶ, πρὸς [τῶν] θεῶν,
 15. [βέλτιστ', ἐρῶντι.] Ge.: τί σὺ λέγεις; ἐρᾷς; Da.: ἐρᾷ.¹

EDWARD CAPPS.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

¹8. So Körte.—12. ληρεῖς and ἐμπέπληγμαι Croiset.—15. βέλτιστ', ἐρῶντι Van Leeuwen. The number of lost letters indicated by Lefebvre in these line is: 9, 15; 10, 15; 11, 15 to >ρ<; 12, 16; 13, 16; 14, 16; 15, 16.